



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,781	05/02/2001	Steven J. Hulai	92509-3	4596
22463 7590 06/09/2008				
SMART AND BIGGAR 438 UNIVERSITY AVENUE SUITE 1500 BOX 111 TORONTO, ON M5G2K8 CANADA				
EXAMINER				
LE, DEBBIE M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2168				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/09/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/846,781

**Applicant(s)**

HULAI ET AL.

**Examiner**

DEBBIE M. LE

**Art Unit**

2168

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No./Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

Applicant's arguments on 4/7/08. Claims 1-16 remain for examination.

### ***Specification***

Objection to the Abstract has been removed.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thornton*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-16 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 28

of copending Application No. 10/537,428. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 28 of the patent application 10/537,428 contain elements of claims 1-16 of the instant application and as such anticipates claims of the instant application.

"A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or **anticipated by**, the earlier claim. *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in for prior art patents); *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d at 1437, 46 USPQ 2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a patent claim to a species within that genus). "ELILILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC., United States Court of Appeal for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001)".

Thus, this is a **provisional** obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yach  
(US Patent Application. Pub. No 2002/0112078 A1).

**As per claim 1, Yach discloses a method of presenting data from an  
application executing at a computing device at a remote wireless device** (para.

0002, 0007 browser application is broken into smaller sub-components) **comprising:**

**receiving at said wireless device, a representation of a text file** (para. 0002,  
displaying web content on a client device) **defining:**

**a format of a user interface for the application at said wireless device** (para.  
0045, as visual output, a screen and output media components displays to the user the  
existing state of the VM environment);

**a format of network messages for exchange of data generated by said  
application** (para. 0012, 0038-0039, wherein the wireless handheld device receives the  
defined virtual machine language, para. 0041, output the common run-time virtual  
machine (hereinafter "VM") programs into an optional byte-code generator that accepts  
the VM program as input and turns the source code representation into byte-code  
representations),

**a format for storing data related to said application at said wireless device**  
(Fig. 3, para. 0046, file storage);

**receiving data from said application in accordance with said format of network messages** (para. 0047, receiving program directly from the file explorer and interface storage), **and presenting said data at said wireless device using said user interface** (para. 0038, 0045, 0048, displaying to the user the existing state of the virtual machine programs).

**As per claim 2, Yach** teaches wherein said text file is received at said device and wherein said text file is an XML file (para. 0039).

**As per claim 3, Yach teaches** wherein said text file is parsed, and a representation of said text file is stored at said device (para. 0011).

**As per claim 4, Yach** teaches storing data generated by said application at said wireless device using said format for storing data (para. 0011).

**As per claim 5, Yach** teaches the text file defines screens, events arising in response to interaction with said screens, and actions for processing said events (para. 0012).

**As per claim 6, Yach** teaches wherein said format of network messages comprises XML definitions for said network messages, and wherein data for said application are dispatched from said mobile device using said XML definitions (para. 0008, 0038).

**As per claim 7, Yach discloses a wireless mobile device comprising:**  
**a processor, computer readable memory in communication with said processor** (Fig. 1, device side, para. 0009), **storing virtual machine software**

**controlling operation** (para. 0010, transmitting virtual machine language to a wireless handheld device receives) **of said device said virtual machine software comprising:**

**a parser (VM interpreter ) for receiving a text file** (para. 0002, displaying web content on a client device);

**a screen generation engine** (byte code generator), **for presenting at least one screen at said device in accordance with said text file** (para. 0012, 0009, a wireless handheld device receives the defined virtual machine language, para. 0041, output the common run-time virtual machine (hereinafter "VM") programs into an optional byte-code generator that accepts the VM program as input and turns the source code representation into byte-code representations, or para. 0007, the translated VM program );

**an event handler for processing events arising in response to interaction with said at least one screen in accordance with said text file** (para. 0045, file explorer and storage interface component uses the screen and output media component in response to user's making selections on the virtual output listing of programs);

**object classes corresponding to actions to be taken by said wireless mobile device in response to interaction with said at least one screen** (par. 0047, 0038, after the VM program has been retrieved by the explorer and storage interface component, the VM engine launches with an indicator of which program to execute. The VM engine then receives the program directly from the file explorer or retrieve the program to be executed from the file system 550),

**an object classes corresponding to a data table for storing data at said wireless mobile device** (Fig. 3, file storage);

**an object class corresponding to a network message to be received or transmitted by said wireless mobile device** (para. 0038).

**As per claim 8, Yach teaches** wherein said memory further stores a representation of said text file (Fig. 3, file storage).

**As per claim 9, Yach teaches** wherein said representation of said text file is created by said parser (para. 0012).

**As per claim 10, Yach teaches** wherein said parser comprises an XML parser (para. 0039).

**As per claim 11, Yach teaches** wherein said object classes corresponding to action to be taken comprise object classes that present screen elements at said device (para. 0036, 0038).

**As per claim 12, Yach teaches** object classes enabling exchange of data between said wireless device and a computing device over a network, wherein said data is formatted in accordance with definitions within said text file (Fig. 3, para. 0043).

**Claim 13** is rejected by the same rationale as state in independent claim 1 arguments.

Claims 14-16 have similar limitations as claims 2-6; therefore, they are rejected under the same subject matter.

***Response to Arguments***



Applicant's arguments filed April 7, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as followed.

Applicant presented argument that "web browser application" as cited by examiner (para. 0002) is effected "without the need for a traditional web browser application (or some other form of content interpretation application) operating at the client machine. Thus, Applicant concludes that Yach fails **"receiving at said wireless device"; "a format of a user interface for the application at said wireless device"** because Yach first fails to teach **presenting data from an application executing at a computing device at a remote wireless device.**

In response, Applicant is further directed to Yach, paragraph 0007 that "browser application to be broken into much smaller sub-components". The browser application to be broken into much smaller sub-components is read on Applicant's claimed limitation presenting data from an application executing at a computing device at a remote wireless device. Yach further describes that "these sub-components may includes an information-fetching component that allows the user to select information to be retrieved...everything fetched by the user of the client machine" would equivalent to Applicant claimed language **"receiving at said wireless device"; "a format of a user interface for the application at said wireless device"**, as detailed layout of claim 1 in the rejection above.

Secondly, Applicant argues the claim 7 recites that "screen generation engine"...is stored...at the wireless mobile device" while Yach could possibly teach "screen generation engine" is resident at the host device.

Similarly to the preceding passages, Yach teaches browser application to be broken into much smaller sub-components (para. 0007 and 0002) is read on Applicant's claimed limitation "screen generation engine...is stored...at the wireless mobile device", as detailed layout in the above rejection of the claim 7.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBBIE M. LE whose telephone number is (571)272-4111. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DEBBIE M LE/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2168

June 3, 2008